REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-27 now stand in the present application, claims 1, 2, 11-13, 18 and 19 having been amended and new dependent claims 26 and 27 having been added. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kambayashi et al. In view of the above-described claim amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims now more clearly patentably define over the cited reference as will be explained in greater detail below.

At page 24 of the Office Action the Examiner has responded to Applicant's prior arguments stating that they fail to patentably distinguish over the cited reference because, for example, the claim language is not expressly "directed to a sequence of unique keys, let alone the use of said keys on distinct information units in an explicit manner, just implicitly in a broad sense." Applicant has endeavored to correct this deficiency as pointed out by the Examiner, hence the above-described claim amendments to each of the independent claims. Now, each independent claim more specifically recites "encrypting a plurality of data units each with a different one of a first sequence of keys." In view of these claim amendments, the Examiner's assertion that a single key used in Kambayashi et al. broadly interpreted by the Examiner would read on to the claim language is no longer the case.

Since Kambayashi et al. is not directed to a method or system in which a plurality of data units are encrypted with each data unit being encrypted by a different one of a

BRISCOE

Appl. No. 10/019,012

September 18, 2006

first sequence of keys, the present claims as amended patentably distinguish over the

cited reference. Accordingly, this ground of rejection is believed to have been mooted

by the above amendments -- thus making it unnecessary to discuss the specific points

raised by the Examiner in any further detail.

Therefore, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully

requested that this application be reconsidered and that all of claims 1-27, now standing

in the application, be allowed and that the case be passed to issue. If there are any

other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a

supplemental response or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is respectfully

requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone exchange indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:

Chris Comuntzis

Reg. No. 31,097

CC:Imr

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22203-1808

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

- 13 -

1116883